

REMARKS:

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 have been amended. Claims 7 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 21-41 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-41 are now pending in this application.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to Figs. 1-2 and 4-5 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83. Applicant submits herewith replacement drawings that are believed to address the objections raised by the Examiner.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected all of the pending independent claims under U.S.C. § 102 based on Bannai, U.S. Patent Number 5,412,486. Applicant traverses these rejections, and submits that in view of the remarks below, the prior version of Applicant's claims were patentably distinct over Bannai. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claims for the purpose of broadening their scope and advancing prosecution.

While Bannai certainly refers to "progressively encoded images," see, e.g., col. 7, line 42, Bannai does not teach or suggest "fetching dynamically-determined extents of the corresponding frame data" as in amended claim 1. With regard to the previously recited "processing element" limitation of claim 1, the Examiner points to Fig. 18, the Abstract, and col. 7, lines 41-67. Fig. 18, however, merely shows that a selector 45 receives a reduced image from lines 52 and 53. Bannai, col. 12, lines 8-10. The "extent" of the image is not "dynamically determined," as in claim 1; rather, the "reduced image" is always $\frac{1}{2}$ the input image. *Id.* The Abstract of Bannai merely refers to the "encoding" of data and teaches or suggests nothing about "fetching dynamically-determined extents" of "frame data." Column 7, lines 41-67 also do not teach the above-recited features of claim 1. The mere reference in this passage to a "reduced image" does not teach or suggest "fetching dynamically-determined extents" as in claim 1. In fact, a given fetch of a stored image in Bannai (e.g., into element 41 in Fig. 9) appears to be of the entirety of the stored image. The fact that an image fetched in Bannai may be subsequently reduced in size

(e.g., by element 42 in Fig. 9) does not place Bannai within the scope of the language of claim 1. Furthermore, the fact that a reduced-size image in Bannai is later operated upon by another element is also irrelevant. Consider the reduced-size output of reduction unit 42. The entirety of this reduced-size image is passed to frame memory 43; thus there is no teaching or suggestion of “fetching dynamically-determined extents ...” as in claim 1. As such, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over Bannai, and thus in condition for allowance, for at least the reasons stated above.

Independent claims 8 and 16 are believed to be patentably distinct over Bannai (along with their respective dependent claims) for reasons similar to those provided above in support of claim 1.

Independent claim 23 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art, as the cited art does not teach or suggest “vary, in real time, the portions of the progressively encoded data received for each of the plurality of video streams,” as recited in claim 23.

Independent claim 27 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art, as the cited art does not teach or suggest “[a] means for determining the extent of frame data to be retrieved for frames of each of one or more of the progressively-encoded video files in the storage system, and for fetching the one or more progressively-encoded video files according to the determined extents,” as recited in claim 27.

Independent claim 28 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art, as the cited art does not teach or suggest “dynamically vary[ing] the portion of frame data received for each of the plurality of video streams,” as recited in claim 28.

Independent claim 34 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art, as the cited art does not teach or suggest “in response to the indication to pause: receiving remaining portions of frame data for a currently displayed frame of the first video stream; and displaying the currently displayed frame with improved image quality,” as recited in claim 34.

Independent claim 36 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art, as the cited art does not teach or suggest “adaptively control the extent of frame data received for each of a plurality of progressively-encoded video streams,” as recited in claim 36.

Independent claim 40 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art, as the cited art does not teach or suggest “adaptively controlling the percentage of frame data received for each of a plurality of progressively-encoded video streams,” as recited in claim 40.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-63700/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 8, 2008

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847